

Dear Commissioners:

Don't prevent states from fixing my cell phone problems. I am writing to oppose CG Docket No. 04-208 and WT Docket No. 05-194, which will unjustly take away the authority of states to tackle problems with cell phone service, including abusive cancellation penalties. Worse, the proposal will put in place a weak set of cell phone company-endorsed rules that offer no improvements in service or enforcement.

It's time to adopt policies that force cell phone companies to improve the level of service they provide to consumers. I think shoddy advertising is one sin America's phones use. They should honestly tell consumers what they are paying for the phone. If they don't know then they may be paying too much for phone service and be ambivious. This goes for future as well as past consumers. They should have no billing errors which could add up to alot. People like Paul for instance could be dealing with a phone service that tell them they are paying this much when they actually are getting alot more for phone service on their bill. They should give the consumer honestly what they should be expecting to give the person making those calls. Say they unexpectedly get a bill that says they talked to a soldier in Iraq and then they phoned a person in Hawaii which you swear you did not call. They should the only charge you for the soldier in Iraq. That is what I have been thinking they did to Paul all along but I can never confirm it because I don't know what the shoddy advertising told him and what the bill was for. I don't know whether they actually charged Paul for instance for calling someone in Hawaii but what I did know is that it was sky high and he ended up paying all of it when I did not know whether the phone company was hiding something. I was convinced my buddy possibly could not have paid 100 dollars or more for phone service. Also it is important to tell consumers honestly about the cellphone contract trial periods. If the trial period actually lasted 30 minutes or even a month, they should honestly tell the consumer that. That way the

consumer will be able to know when he is supposed to stop the trial period and then he can honestly know when to start buying his phone. If they don't do that the consumer may make more calls over the trial period and thus it will be chaos time when the trial period should be over because he'll think he has more days on his trial period when actually he may not. This is worthless because it just destroys consumer confidence in the phone and makes him in debt not knowing when the trial period actually ends. I think that is most important about buying your phone: the consumer should be able to trust the phone by the honesty of the cellphone industry. If they get paid too much or have no clue when the trial period ends, then the cellphone industry is simply not being honest. They should honestly phone the consumer before they bill the consumer to check whether it is the right amount on the bill and they should tell them exactly when their trial period should end. If the advertising says it should be ended in August, your trial period should end in August. This is the problem with consumers buying cellphones today: the trial period could be over in September or October even though you bought it in January or February. The honest trial period should be over sixteen days to a few months after you bought the service. This was true with Paul. He got it in September but they were still charging him not only for the trial period but also for what they thought he owed the cellphone industry for a few calls in December and before they fixed it it was January 15th. Thus, he had to pay more for cellphone service than he had wished in December and was in debt. You never want the phone company to do this to you. It could deplete your funds especially if you want a present for your brother in Iraq or even if you have a sister serving there. Brent of course lost his cellphone each time exactly when they stopped charging him for the trial period so I don't know what the bill was exactly when he lost the phone. He kept on getting them and then losing them five months later when the trial period finally ended. Brent's and the story of Paul's should be reason enough to tell them reasonably when the trial period is over and when you

can start using the phone. Otherwise they are using gimmicky tactics to make the prices seem more expensive than the advertising says they should be. That is just not right and they should only be billing someone for who they actually talked to. Rules are meaningless if they don't provide some honesty. An appropriate rule might be that the trial period should be over exactly 3 months or less and they should be only paying for the soldier in Iraq not the lady in Hawaii or France or Italy if they did not call them. Now I understand you might want to call someone in France if you are trying to learn their language but otherwise, why would you call that person? I certainly wouldn't want to be charged for calling some man in France unless I actually wanted to understand the man's language. I know Italy could be different a little but still I would only call Italy if I was trying to learn a Roman language or something or trying to market a food I really liked in Italy. Maybe the cellphone industry needs to realize that if you don't have a reason for their suspicion that you called Italy or France, then they should take that off your bill but of course don't do that if they actually have a brother or sister living there and they should ask about it. They should phone the consumer one day before the bill should be issued and ask, sir do you have a brother or sister living in France or Italy or are you trying to understand the local language there. If it is Roman, they should ask whether you have any desire to take Roman in school. I think Rome is either in Italy or somewhere near there. I had no desire to take Roman so I never went to Rome. Paul got charged for talking to someone from Rome though and he didn't like it but later he did tell me he thought the charge was funny. I agreed. If the charge is funny, ask yourself this: Did I really want to talk to someone over there and take the language? Most often you wouldn't. I know having a cellphone is a privilege but it should be at least a credible privilege. I have yet to ask Josh if they charged him with something unreasonable. If so, it should be addressed with sincerity. I wouldn't want anything like that happening to me or any of my friends that are close that

have a cellphone as a possession. Thus please if you notice any suspicious charges, tell your cellphone industry they should have been honest about it and then the cellphone should have the improved service you want when you should get it. They should not charge you for anyone you swear you did not call and they should have rules limiting the trial period to the three months it should be. I swear it should be three months too because I've seen some commercials. I have been doing it because I want to get a cellphone with honest terms in two months and was wondering about the trial periods that should have been guidelines long ago. I don't know what the government thinks when the cellphone industry thinks up these terms. I don't think the advertising was made to be shoddy. I just think the terms made the advertising be twisted a little. I suggest the cellphone industry check what they are telling the public and match it up to reality. Then and only then will people start to believe in the cellphone industry. Rules start to shape everything because they want to do it as the rules say they can. If the rules are not honest, the cellphone industry should change the rules. Please don't keep the rules but change them. Ohio's consumers should be confident that what they are paying is right. The highest quality cellphone service is more important than anything else in the world to me, Sarran, and maybe Paul. I don't know about the rest of the world but I'd think they'd like that too. Then they would actually know who they were talking to and how they should have been paid even for their trial period. Honesty can provide the best service any consumer would want. Isn't that important too?

Although CG Docket No. 04-208 purports to address consumer frustration with confusing cell phone bills, hidden fees and misleading advertising, the proposal does little for consumers. In the name of helping us, the agency is proposing to block states from passing their own pro-consumer laws. As bad, WT Docket No. 05-194 would bar state courts from enforcing state law when it comes to unfair and abusive cell phone contracts. That's going too

far.

States are responding to consumer complaints. Don't stop them! And don't give in to adopting weak, industry-drafted rules in their place. The FCC should stand up to the cell phone industry, and respect states rights and strong consumer protections.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Crowe